



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

BRIEF MENTION.

If Professor Robinson Ellis, who has taken under his special patronage the Minor Latin Poets, had not induced his friend, Mr. E. J. L. SCOTT, to undertake a translation of *Calpurnius* into English verse (London, George Bell & Sons, 1890), that little-read bucolic poet would doubtless have waited many generations for an interpreter, and we should have lost a series of English poems, which by deftness of rhyme and vividness of expression show that the translator could have done even better things on his own account than he has done for Calpurnius. Mr. Scott's translation of the Eclogues of Vergil in a similar style had a certain quaint fascination, to which attention was called at the time (A. J. P. V 544). His rendering of Calpurnius, if not so close, leaves us better satisfied, for he has burnished Calpurnius until the shade of the very moderate poet might well wonder at the new foliage and the alien fruit. To be sure, the pastoral simplicity of Calpurnius suffers somewhat, but one does not care for the pastoral simplicity of the man who composed the adulatory Fourth Eclogue—which is too much even for those whom Vergil and Horace have taught a certain indulgence toward court-poetry. The Latin text is not very carefully printed, and it is surprising that Professor Ellis should have allowed so many old-fashioned spellings to stand. Nor does the translation always accord with the text. In III 95 we find

Vel propius latitans vicina saepe sub horti

translated

Or 'neath this neighboring altar lie,
As oft in its vicinity,

and as *saepe* is spelt elsewhere *sepe* (V 95), we are in a daze until we look up the variant reading

Vel propius latitans vicina saepe sub ara.

There are other slips, but not of sufficient magnitude to mar pleasure or to rouse mirth.

Mr. SHUCKBURGH brings the equipment of a classical scholar to bear on his edition of *Sidney's Apologie for Poetrie* (New York, Macmillan & Co.), which follows in the main the text of the edition of 1595. The notes are ample for the illustration of the text, and a full index enhances the value of the notes. The excellent work of Professor Cook, noticed in a recent number of the *Journal* (XI 389), is not superseded by that of his English rival, and those of us who are accustomed to deal with tenth transmissions of stock observations will be pleased to see how the American editor and the English complement each other. Detailed criticism would be out of place here. It may be observed, however, that the story of the Sophister (58, 16), 'that with too much

subtlety, would prove two eggs three,' is to be found in Sir Thomas More, and that Mr. Shuckburgh ought not to have been satisfied with a mere parallel; and it is possible that he has dismissed *Herculea proles* (62, 28) too lightly. Why should Sidney have fallen into Latin here, if he meant nothing more than 'royal, as were the royal families of Sparta'? We want a contrast to *libertino patre natus*, and that contrast is furnished by the *Herculea gens* of the Fabii—that ancient Roman family, commemorated in a passage, that Sidney must have read, Ovid, *Fasti* II 235 foll.:

Una dies Fabios ad bellum miserat omnes;
ad bellum missos perdidit una dies.
Ut tamen *Herculeae* superessent semina *gentis*,
credibile est ipsos consuluisse deos.

In the paragraph of his grammar (§511 Anm.) in which Aken comments on the rarity of the opt. after *ἕως*, he cites only aorists. But the real trouble is to find present optatives, and while there is a well-known instance in Thuc. 3, 102, cited in A. J. P. IV 418 (see Goodwin, M. and T., rev. ed. §614), that is an 'until' *ἕως*. A 'while,' 'so long as' *ἕως* with the pres. opt. after an histor. tense has not turned up, so far as I know. Perhaps the bare announcement will bring out a number of these skulkers, but in the article cited (1883) I could only say, 'pres. opt. as required by general rules of dependence; so after inf. and *ἄν* (= opt. and *ἄν*), Plat. Theat. 155 A': *μηδέποτε μηδὲν ἂν μείζον μηδὲ ἑλάττω γενέσθαι μήτε ὅγκῳ μήτε ἀριθμῷ ἕως ἴσον εἴη αὐτὸ ἑαυτῷ*. The language of Aristotle lies outside my range of special investigation, but I am interested to find in the newly-discovered 'Αθηναίων πολιτεία one example of the missing construction that goes back to the fourth century (p. 80, 8): *δοκεῖ (Θηραμένης) πάσας (sc. τὰς πολιτείας) προάγειν* (= *προηγεν*) *ἕως μηδὲν παρανομοῖεν*.

Revisions that do not revise are too common to astonish even the revisers, and hence my merriment was not much stirred by the Homeric laughter with which some of my friends have greeted the reappearance of Kühner's classical lapse which turned 'Bekker's *Homerische Blätter*' into 'Bekker's *Fliegende Blätter*.' See *Blass's Kühner* (1890), I 1, p. 98. But that is after all a mere lapse, and pages of the *Journal* might be taken up with a record of the perpetuation of grave blunders. So in Gustav Meyer's *Gr. Gr.*, first ed. (1880), p. 110, we read 'Aristophanes *Wolken* 870, wo sich Sokrates über die Aussprache des *κρέμασι* beim alten *Pheidippides* lustig macht,' and the same blunder reappears in the ed. of 1886, p. 125. To be sure, Gustav Meyer is quoting from Curtius, *Stud.* I 2, 275, and it is easy to see how in his eagerness to make a point Curtius turned the facts round; but the error was pointed out at the time of the first ed., and some of the hundreds of Meyer's readers ought to have secured the correction before the second appeared.

In the closing words of Mr. HEWLETT's valuable paper *On the Articular Infinitive in Polybius* (A. J. P. XI 470), the writer denies the existence of *παρά* = *διά* with the articular inf. in Demosthenes. The passage which I cite in the

foot-note (21, 96), if written out would have contradicted the text: *παρὰ τὴν πενίαν καὶ ἐρημίαν καὶ τὸ πολλὸν εἰς εἶναι*, but it is one thing to use an articular inf. at the end of a group of substantives (see A. J. P. IV 241), another to use it independently. An independent use is cited by Lutz, Praepositionen bei den Attischen Rednern, p. 153, from 19, 42: *παρὰ τὸ προαισθῆσθαι κεκώλυται*, and this should have been adduced. See also Rehdantz-Blass, Index II, s. v. *παρὰ*.

À propos of my little note in the last number of the Journal (XI 483-487) on the Articular Proper Noun in Greek, I would call attention to the beginning of a useful series in Philologus XLIX 3, by KALLENBERG, *Der Artikel bei Namen von Ländern, Städten, u. s. w.*, in which he expresses his 'conviction of the inadequateness of our knowledge as to the most ordinary phenomena of Greek.' The same conviction has haunted me for many years, and may serve to explain, if explanation be needful, the persistency with which I have urged the importance of accurate attainments in a language, which is more raved about than possessed.

ERRATA.

A recent medical writer maintains that there is no absolute immunity from seasickness, and so no amount of typographical experience will insure an editor against nausea at errors of the press. The unwelcome queasiness will return when least expected. My boyhood's friend Pyrgopolinices shakes his empty head at me from A. J. P. XI 372 (l. 19 from bottom) and asks what has become of the *g* so necessary to his martial register; and the comparatively venial fault of an imbricated 'vaüt' in Mr. Ashburnham's review of Ellis's Avianus (IX 362, l. 13) has haunted me so for two years that I have given up entirely that seemingly inevitable quotation, 'La saulce vaut mieux que le poisson,' and have gone back from Scaliger to Scaliger's original,

ὀβολοῦ τάριχος, δὴ' ὀβολῶν τάρτυματα.

And now *à propos* of Ellis's Avianus, it appears that in the last number (XI 522, l. 24) we must read 'Ellis is too much inclined to assume that the prosody of Avianus was the prosody of the classical period' instead of 'the prosody of Avianus was prosody.' In my judgment the mistake is not much to be deplored. Unfortunately all mistakes are not so venial, and Jean Paul's humorous boast remains a *pium desiderium*, 'In jeden Druckfehler soll sich Verstand verstecken und in die Errata Wahrheiten.'